

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his timely response in the Advisory Action mailed May, 6 2004. In reply, the Applicant would like to clarify the distinctions between the cited reference Gadre and the invention. In particular, claim 1, requires

at least one processing unit for processing software programmed to perform *at least some subpicture data stream decoding* and subpicture display control command execution; and

a subpicture hardware unit configured to receive said subpicture pixel data stream, subpicture display control information extracted from a subpicture display control command executed by said at least one processing unit, subpicture display control commands not executed by said at least one processing unit, and execute the subpicture display control commands not executed by said at least one processing unit, and generate subpicture display information for communication to a DVD video display unit..."

Therefore, in contrast to Gadre, the decoding of the subpicture data stream is performed by both the at least one processing unit and the subpicture hardware unit since only "some subpicture data stream decoding" is performed by the at least one processing unit and wherein the subpicture hardware unit is "configured to...execute the subpicture display control commands not executed by said at least one processing unit". In this way, the at least one processing unit performs only some of the subpicture data stream decoding and some of the subpicture display control command execution since the subpicture hardware unit executes the subpicture display control commands not executed by the processor. Therefore, the task sharing between the at least one processor and subpicture hardware unit provides a more efficient, in both time and resource, system than available in Gadre since processing tasks are strictly defined with no options for task sharing between the processor or hardware unit.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 1 and all of its dependent claims are neither anticipated or suggested by Gadre and are allowable.

Independent claims 16 and 28 recite essentially the same limitations as independent claim 1 and are therefore also allowable for at least the reasons stated for claim 1. All remaining

dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 16 and/or 28 and are therefore also allowable.

The Examiner rejected a number of claims as being unpatentable under U.S.C. 103(a) over Gadre in view of U.S. Patent 5,758,007 issued to Kitamura et al which has been discussed in detail in previous responses and therefore adds nothing to the primary reference Gadre to render the rejected dependent claims 15 and 30 as being unpatentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300